

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, September 23, 1988

Present: C. Bertrand, Chair; B. Spanos; E. Gardham; C. Foster; G. Hochman; R.H.Pallen; D. Dicks; S. Ruby; G. Valaskakis; J. Gavin; P. Widden; Z.Hamlet; E. Preston; I. Irvine; R. Schmid; G. Auchinachie; R. Kilgour; C. Levy; M. Barlow; H. deRomer; G. Decarie; R. Perigoe; M. Giguere; W.Byers; C. Barton; C. Gray; C. White; M. Oppenheim; J. Drysdale; B.Barkman; J. Ryan; M. Brian; H. Shulman; C. Davis; R. Seppanen; S. O'Hara; R. Pollock; A. Macpherson; H. McLachlan; Y.-L. Khouri; E. Notkin; S.Letovsky; W. Jen.

Regrets: J. Appleby; D. Acland; H. McQueen; S. Hoecker-Drysdale; W. Gilsdorf.

Absent: D. Salee; G. Trudel; D. Shapiro; G. Szamosi; D. White; I. Ricard.

Documents considered and distributed at this meeting

ASFC 88-7M-A	Nominations/Ratification Required - Summary
ASFC 88-7M-B	Election of Four (4) Faculty Members to Serve on the ASFC Steering Committee
ASFC 88-7M-C	Guidelines for Senate Evaluation of University Research Centres
ASFC 88-7M-D	Academic Planning in the Faculty of Arts and Science
ASFC 88-7M-D (REV)	Academic Planning in the Faculty of Arts and Science (as revised after meeting with Vice-Rector, Academic)
ASFC 88-7M-E	Acquisitions Budget 1988-1989
ASFC 88-7M-F	Guidelines for Senate Evaluation of University Research Centres - Proposed Amendments to Senate Document US-88-2-D11

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1342 hrs.

2. Approval of Agenda

88-7-1 It was moved and seconded (Drysdale/Oppenheim) that the agenda be approved.

Vote: CARRIED

3. Approval of the Minutes of May 13, 1988

88-7-2 It was moved and seconded (Barlow/Oppenheim) that the Minutes of May 13, 1988, be approved.

Vote: CARRIED

88-7-3 It was moved and seconded (Byers/Preston) that the Minutes of May 24, 1988, be approved.

Correction: Page 7, paragraph 2: "The proposed Major in French Studies (Francophone Literature)..." should read (Dicks) "The proposed Major in Studies of the French Speaking World..."

Vote: CARRIED

4. Remarks from the Chair

1. The Chair opened his remarks by welcoming everyone to the first meeting of the year.
2. The Chair drew Council's attention to document ASFC 88-7M-D (REV) on "Academic Planning in the Faculty of Arts and Science" a revised version of document ASFC 88-7M-D mailed to members last week. Council was to note that a key paragraph on page 2 had been rewritten, to take out the underlining of admission quotas. The paragraph had been reworded to accomplish the same end.
3. Also distributed were: document ASFC 88-7M-F "Proposed Amendments to Senate Document US-88-2-D11 - Guidelines for Senate Evaluation of University Research Centres, and ASFC 88-7M-E "Acquisitions Budget 1988-1989" forwarded by the Library in response to Council's request for a breakdown of the library allocations.
4. Further to an article in the Thursday Report calling for Honorary Degree nominations, the Dean pointed out that special forms were now available in his office for those who wished to nominate someone. Forms could also be obtained from Ms. Rosy Montuori, Secretary, Board of Governors Office, Room BC-320 (local 4814). It was stressed that this was particularly important to Arts and Science, because it referred to Spring Convocation, when Arts and Science is alone. Council was to consider candidates for an Honorary Degree.

5. In response to a question raised at the May 13 ASFC meeting regarding the breakdown of the library allocations, each member had received a copy of document ASFC 88-7M-E.
6. As a result of discussions at the April and May ASFC meetings, a request was sent to the Rector's Office, asking whether it would be worthwhile to have the Secretary General investigate the possibility of establishing standardized rules of order for all of the legislative bodies in the University. The response, in brief, read: "While he [the Rector] has no inherent objection to the development of uniformity in this area, he believes that any such uniformity should be the result of a natural process and not one brought about by the imposition of any group's particular preference." The Dean suggested that Council could decide precisely which rules of order it wished to use.
7. In response to a question raised at the May ASFC meeting, a memorandum had been sent to Roger Côté, asking for a breakdown of recipients of the University's Entry Scholarships. A response has not been received to date.
8. The Chair advised Council that a reception to honour the winners of the Entry Scholarships and other undergraduate scholarships took place on September 22, 1988. Seventy-five of the New Canadian Entry Scholarships in Science were allocated to Concordia. Arts and Science had 35 (23 of the 35 went to women).
9. Further to a discussion at the May ASFC meeting regarding "average salaries for the various ranks for all Faculties" - a memorandum had been sent to Faculty Personnel asking for further information. A response has not been received to date.
10. In response to a question regarding the high proportion of scholastic awards in Exercise Science, Roger Côté has advised that the only standard used for scholastic awards is the G.P.A.
11. In response to another item raised at the April ASFC meeting regarding the policy on take-home exams in terms of deadlines, the Chair stated that, according to the Director of Examinations, Lynne Campbell, the only element of policy on take-home exams is that they should not be due during the last week of classes, but rather during the exam period, as is the case with final examinations.

5. Questions and Announcements

1. A question was raised (Macpherson) regarding the G.P.A. regulations passed at Senate. The main concern was whether Faculty Council would have a voice in the formulation of these regulations, and whether these regulations were Calendar entries.

In response it was explained (Dicks) that Council had seen them. The Curriculum Committee was instructed by Council to improve the copy. This improved copy was circulated to Council members, with a request for comments. The final draft was distributed to Council at the last meeting, and those regulations were passed by Senate at the May 27, 1988 meeting.

2. It was announced (Pallen) that on May 31 the Centre for Research in Human Development of the Department of Psychology received an extremely favourable review by FCAR and was awarded \$ 180,000 per year for a five-year period, as well as a \$60,000 equipment grant.
3. As a follow-up to the question of take home examinations, it was suggested (Valaskakis) that perhaps the Dean's Office send a notice to all faculty announcing that take-home exams were not to be due prior to the exam period.

The Dean suggested that it might be best to approach the Vice-Rector, Academic, and ask that this item be included in the notice regarding the scheduling of examinations.

It was pointed out (Decarie) that this problem has existed for several years. It was suggested that action be taken against those who hold exams in the last week of classes instead of sending a notice.

The Dean explained that if a notice was not sent out, someone might claim ignorance. It was also stated that CUSA should alert students that they did not have to tolerate such a situation, and that they could approach the Chair of the Department, or the Dean of the Faculty.

It was stated (Oppenheim) that the policy on take-homes was not explicit with regard to grade sheets either, i.e. if an instructor does not have an examination scheduled during the exam period, his/her grade sheets are due within two days of the last class. This implies that the take-home exam is in fact due during the last week of classes or very soon afterwards, which leads to the question of when grade-sheets are due if a take-home exam is given.

The Dean suggested that the same notice from the Vice-Rector Academic could clarify the due date for grade sheets where take home exams are used.

4. A question was raised (O'Hara) regarding the article in the Thursday Report announcing the appointment of Normand Proulx as an advisor to the senior administration on matters relating to government funding. While the University aims to promote and strengthen graduate programmes, while the Political Science Department's only Masters programme is in Public Policy, Public Administration, and while Concordia graduate students could fill this position, the person hired was educated at l'Université de Montréal, has taught at UQAM, and has been with CREPUQ for ten years. It was asked whether the Dean could request the administration to justify hiring someone who has never had any practical experience with Concordia's underfunding. Perhaps it could also be asked whether anyone from within Concordia (employee or graduate) had applied for this position.

In response the Dean stated that while this was a delicate issue, he would write to the Vice-Rector, Institutional Relations and Finance, to obtain clarification.

6. Election - ASFC Steering Committee Members
(Document ASFC 88-7M-B)

The Dean pointed out that all members who were eligible to serve on the ASFC Steering Committee were listed on document ASFC 88-7M-B. He added that Steering Committee meetings had been scheduled to take place on Wednesday mornings at 10:00 a.m. Those ASFC members who teach on Wednesday morning are eligible to have their names taken off the ballot. ASFC members who have not served at least one year on Faculty Council are not eligible. P. Widden (BIOL) and J. Gavin (APSS) were deleted from the ballot.

In response to a question (Irvine) regarding the mandate of the Steering Committee, the Dean stated the mandate as follows: to prepare the agenda, to guide the ASFC debates, to make recommendations concerning issues that should go to Council or other bodies, to facilitate the business of Council.

Election results:

Arts and Science Faculty Council Steering Committee

J. Drysdale	- Sociology & Anthropology
G. Decarie	- History
W. Gilsdorf	- Communication Studies
G. Auchinachie	- English

7. Notice of Election
(Document ASFC 88-7M-A)

A notice of election, as well as the required ratification of student representatives, was announced for the October meeting of Council.

8. Guidelines for Senate Evaluation of University Research Centres
(Document ASFC 88-7M-C)

The Dean stated that this document had been referred to Council by the secretary of Senate. Senate required the Council's recommendations in time for its October meeting.

Following a meeting of the Dean, Dr. Pallen, and the Directors of the two centres in Psychology, the Centre in Applied Social Science, and the Centre for Broadcasting Studies, two amendments to improve the document had been recommended.

88-7-4 It was moved and seconded (Pallen/Valaskakis) that document US-88-2-D11 be amended as follows:

On page 3, Section IV, the first paragraph to read: "It is resolved that the inter-Faculty and inter-University Centres will submit to the Senate Research Committee..."

Vote: CARRIED

88-7-5 It was moved and seconded (Pallen/Dicks) that document US-88-2-D11 be further amended as follows:

On page 4, add the following new paragraph:

b) "That the Centres located within a Faculty will be reviewed by processes established by the Faculty involved."

Vote: CARRIED

88-7-6 It was moved and seconded (Pallen/Levy) that document US-88-2-D11 as amended by the Arts and Science Faculty Council be approved and forwarded to Senate.

Vote: CARRIED

9. Academic Planning and Priorities
(Document ASFC 88-7M-D REV)

Council moved into the position of a committee of the whole.

It was pointed out (Decarie) that on page 3, the document referred to the allocation of resources for teaching and research. The sentences that followed made no reference to the allotment of resources for teaching; in fact, the only mention of teaching occurred as a penalty for not completing research. It was suggested to rephrase this paragraph so that the word teaching be deleted, as the document only referred to the allocation of resources for research.

In response it was stated (Pallen) that the existence of a Learning Development Office indicated that the University had invested some resources into teaching; however, at the same time, compared to other Quebec universities, the allocation of resources for research has been low at Concordia.

The increased support for student advising, mentioned in the document, was welcomed (Brian). However, the lack of a mention of quality control was deplored. It was also questioned whether appropriate incentives and/or rewards had been considered, or whether advising would be added onto the current workloads of faculty members.

The Dean replied that significant remissions would be required.

The connection between increasing support for student advising and implementing a schedule for major curriculum changes was questioned (Ryan).

In response it was stated (Dicks) that it was necessary to design a schedule for future curriculum changes so that the Faculty would be aware of future resource demands rather than dealing with the changes on an ad hoc basis. Such a schedule would help advisors as they would know what programme changes to anticipate, and as a result advise students appropriately.

The Dean added that if one were to have faculty members responsible for advising, it would be necessary to keep them informed as to the curriculum changes in the Faculty so that they could advise students on both their present and future programmes.

It was pointed out (Drysdale) that the last sentence on the paragraph on graduate studies indicated an imbalance or priority in providing discretionary resources to existing graduate programmes as opposed to launching new graduate programmes. The word "cautious" seemed to indicate that there was a question of the relative priority of existing versus new programmes. The statistics in the preliminary report of the études sectorielles of the Social Sciences, showed that l'Université de Montréal offered eleven Ph.D. programmes in the twelve disciplines and fields included in the study; l'Université Laval offered seven; McGill University offered six; l'Université du Québec offered four; and Concordia University offered two (Economics and Psychology). Regardless of what was being done with the Faculty's limited resources the University's relative standing would only be improved through the development of more new doctoral programmes in these fields. This is not to suggest that existing doctoral programmes not be supported, nor that the launching of graduate programmes be started indiscriminately, but that it seemed appropriate that the Faculty take a long range view beyond the 1990-92 period. It was suggested that a statement be added to take into account the idea of making a commitment to attempt to develop new graduate programmes, where the need is demonstrable and where an appropriate resource base already exists.

The Dean replied that he would welcome the addition of a sentence to that effect. He added that the "cautious" approach meant that the development of new graduate programmes may be limited to those proposals that are currently under consideration as it would be unrealistic to expect completely new ones to be ready for 1992. It is known for example that the Department of Political Science plans, within five years, to come forward with a Ph.D. proposal. A sentence such as the one suggested by Dr. Drysdale would be a welcome addition as it would take into consideration a proposal such as the Ph.D. in Political Science.

The meaning of the following (last paragraph on page 2) was questioned (Seppanen): "...the Faculty will adopt a specific policy to ensure that it can provide departments and colleges with sufficient resources to enable them to offer quality education. One step... A second step would be to examine ways to increase the number of full-time faculty, particularly in departments with a large number of part-time instructors." The relationship between quality education and the large number of part-timers was questioned considering that a great deal of the Faculty's teaching is done by part-time instructors.

In response the Dean stated that, while in some areas part-time instructors do very important work, there are other areas where having a full-time faculty member would be better for the department in terms of student advising, committee work, teaching, research, and so on. Hidden in this sentence is the intent to begin negotiations with the Vice-Rector to move money from part-time positions to full-time positions. This is in accordance with the wishes of full-time faculty members who have stated that more full-time positions are needed.

It was further stated (Seppanen) that the original question was mostly related to Professor Decarie's statement that the punishment for not doing research is having to teach. It was questioned whether it was logical to assume that full-time professors hired under this scheme would devote any more time to teaching than they do at present. One of the advantages of part-time instructors is that they are hired to teach. This issue must be addressed.

The Dean agreed that part-time instructors do a good job, but the message from the Faculty has been that more full-time faculty members are needed, and the only way to increase full-time faculty is to cut down on the part-time budget.

With regard to admission quotas the Dean stated that the overall issue had to be considered, as there were some departments that already had admissions quotas, others that perhaps should or shouldn't. The University should decide on the message it wishes to give to prospective students - i.e. whether Concordia wishes to be the "last chance" University - and whether the Faculty wishes to admit failed CEGEP students.

It was stressed (Decarie) that Council consider removing the phrase "quality education" from paragraph 3 on page 2. This phrase may be suitable in an advertising campaign but not in a Faculty's planning document. Furthermore, the question of quotas should be considered very carefully. Perhaps the Faculty wished to move in the direction of implementing admission quotas; however this would also imply "turning our backs" on what Concordia originally stood for, and becoming exclusive. The University should not be ashamed of being the College of the Last Chance. It was felt that there was nothing good in excluding people, or in only admitting students with high numerical grades. It would mean that the University was accepting uncritically the evaluation of the public schools and the CEGEPS. A number of faculty members at this University are faculty members today because they went to the College of the Last Chance. These persons may have been rejected under the standards that are now being proposed. The virtue of the people who founded Sir George and Loyola was that they wanted to do something different. Now a change is being proposed, not because the University wishes to do something, but because Concordia wants to look like everybody else. The comparison to other institutions in Council's discussion was considered astonishing. The only hope would be that if the University had to have quotas, the possibility of other kinds of quotas besides grade averages should be explored.

Another member (Oppenheim) disagreed with the above statements. It was felt that the University had to make decisions about where it was going, and to allocate money for graduate studies and research, not to mirror other institutions but to decide for itself what it wished to be. In terms of Professor Drysdale's comment, the word "cautious" was considered important, as departments that do not have doctoral or masters programmes should consider the development of such programmes in a cautious manner. The idea of finding new ways of allocating resources for faculty development was also considered interesting. The overall problem with the document seemed that it was very general and that it implied the use of many resources - faculty development, teaching, graduate studies and research. One might question where these resources will come from given that the bottom paragraph on page 2 implies admitting fewer students, and by transforming part-time positions into full-time positions, cutting back on course offerings.

The Dean responded that it was correct to assume that he would have to request extra funds for special projects (i.e. student advising), but at the same time the curriculum would have to be streamlined because the Faculty would not be able to offer as many courses.

Concern was expressed (Shulman) about the overall nature of a University and what this document was all about considering what was happening elsewhere in North American education. It may be pleasant for departments and faculty to have graduate students, but this does not help the University's undergraduate students in attaining a decent undergraduate education. It was felt that statements such as "...will continue to endorse the concept of specialization in university education" did not say very much nor would it give Concordia an identity which would be different from other universities in Montreal.

It was argued (deRomer) that there was nothing wrong in using quotas, if it applied to raising standards. Academic advisors should play a role in deciding what type of students should be admitted and what courses they should take.

It was further stated (Byers) that the Department of Mathematics agreed with the idea of allocating more resources for graduate studies; however, the connection between student advising and major curriculum changes was vague. Whether major curriculum changes would be discouraged, or slowed down, should depend on the merits of the case and not applied as a general policy. It was felt that the issue of Contract Sabbatical leaves did not apply to the Department of Mathematics, as one can not do creative research on order.

In response Vice-Dean Valaskakis clarified that there seemed to be a general misunderstanding regarding the meaning of Contract Sabbaticals, which has been a very successful faculty development activity at York University for the retraining of faculty members. These sabbaticals are not related to the existing sabbaticals. Contract Sabbaticals would be for a particular project, or book, or research that a faculty member may be interested in and it would be in addition to the normal Sabbatical.

With regard to admission quotas, it was argued (Byers) that admission to the University should not depend on a number which would most likely be determined by the Admissions Office or the Registrar's Office. Not only would the Faculty end up making decisions based on numbers, but on numbers that are monitored by a computer in the Admissions Office. It was felt that the most difficult thing with this document was to find some sort of balance between strengthening research and maintaining the traditional role of the University. It appeared that the document was a resource allocation document rather than an academic planning document. An academic planning document should include the areas of teaching and undergraduate programmes, as it is one of the few things that would make a public statement and thus influence the general climate of the Faculty. It should therefore be written carefully, with a little more balance, and something specific in the areas of teaching and education.

The Dean stated that it was difficult to achieve such a balance in the first draft of the document. In preparing a document that covered a two year period, graduate education and research had to be stressed. The 1992-94 document could probably stress undergraduate programmes and teaching, and a third document could perhaps be a three year plan. Writing an all-encompassing document is difficult, and the purpose of the first document was to at least achieve some of the priorities listed.

In response it was stated (Byers) that the first document was extremely decisive as it could set trends. It should not be too specific so that there is room to expand the planning process to other areas if necessary.

Concern was also expressed (Macpherson) with regard to the effect that the transforming of part-time to full-time positions would have on the standard of teaching and whether such a change would result in larger classes.

It was added (Jen) that the Faculty must determine its goals, and whether it wants to "educate" or "train" students.

With reference to paragraph 2 on page 2, it was stated (Ryan) that this was in essence a motherhood statement that tried to please everybody. The Faculty will have to make a choice between whether it is more important to concentrate on strengths or to maintain a range of courses. Sometimes a range of courses can reflect a weakness in a programme, rather than a strength, and the cutting down may benefit the student. The relationship of the third paragraph to the second one is problematic because it moves from a concern with undergraduate education and its excellence to a concentration on graduate studies. Not all departments would be able to strengthen both areas at the same time. One would be strengthened at the expense of the other.

Vice-Dean Ruby commented on the lack of commitment to improving teaching. However, the document honestly reflected the departmental submissions forwarded to the Dean's Committee. Advising was indeed an important issue, and a great deal of credit must be given to the advisors for the wonderful work they do.

In relation to admissions quotas, it was stated (Irvine) that in writing this document one must consider the implementation of the G.P.A. requirement. Students should not be judged solely on the basis of the grades they receive at CEGEP. The University should provide them with the opportunity to develop further, but, at the same time, clearly inform them about the University's expectations. In relation to the statement that "...the Faculty will concentrate on the development of its strengths but, at the same time, maintain a range of courses..." the Department of Economics felt that it was possible to concentrate on strengthening research while at the same time offering a wide variety of undergraduate courses. If this statement were developed further the apparent inconsistencies would be eliminated.

The Dean pointed out that the document read "...will be to examine how the establishment of admission quotas ... would facilitate the implementation of..." which implied that there would be a variety of possibilities. In the Journalism programme for example all applicants are interviewed. This, however, would require a strong commitment on the part of the departments.

Concern was also expressed (Widden) with regard to the underlying assumption that "resources put into research and graduate studies" would necessarily detract from undergraduate education. Universities that have research activities involve their undergraduate students in those activities. Both research and graduate studies can be used to enhance undergraduate education. If undergraduate students are brought into research projects both undergraduate and graduate programmes can benefit.

It was agreed (Gray) that it is possible to achieve some of the objectives set out in the document without being pressured into making tragic choices.

The Dean thanked Council members for their contributions and comments, and asked that any further ideas for changes to the document be forwarded to his office so that the document could be reworked so that it reflected the academic planning and priorities of the Faculty more clearly.

Council moved out of the Committee of the whole.

10. Other Business

None.

11. Next Meeting

Friday, October 14, 1988, at 1330 hrs, in AB-131, Loyola Campus.

12. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded (Widden/Schmid) that the meeting be adjourned at 1539 hrs.

Vote: CARRIED

BS: jpd 5/10/88